## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/730,619	BECKER, BURKHARD	
Examiner	Art Unit	
YONG CHOE	2185	

	YONG CHOE	2185			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 20 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>∑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.		
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CPR 1.13(e). The date- nave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext and of the control of the	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
AMENDMENTS					
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>			cause		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		L below),			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for		
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).		
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	planation of		
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>9,10,16 and 17</u> . Claim(s) rejected: 1-3.5-8.11-15 and 18-23.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. M The request for reconsideration has been conside because: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		•			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				

/Gary J Portka/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2188

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed on 06/20/2008 have been fully consider but they are not persuasive. For example, Regarding applicant's remarks on page 2-4, applicants argue that none of the cited references provide any teaching or suggestion to employ an icrementation rule or a decrementation rule for computing addresses. In response, it is well know to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Arithmetic Logic Uhit (ALU) must provide the arithmetic computation basic rules such as incrementation or decrementation rule in order to compute data, address, etc." Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the base address as taught by Tipon et al. with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess to obtain the invention.